



05.06-05

IFW

NUCORE
IN

United States Patent & Trademark Office
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria,
VA 22313-1450

4th May, 2005



Ref: Application No. 10/750,214

Attn. Examiner Ms. Jennifer A. Poker

Dear Ms. Poker,

Thank you for your courtesy in responding to our telephone request for further information with regard to your Office Action Summary with respect to our Application No. 10/750,214. We are appreciative of your assistance, particularly in light of our loss of services of our patent attorney.

As I explained during our telephone call, what we desire to patent is a new type of inductor – namely self-damped inductors. There are various types of inductors available in the open market with varying geometries and varying core materials. Our figures depict a few of the common types, however it is our belief that the self-damping can be applied to all types of inductors (and that is what we would like our claims to reflect).

We achieve the self damping properties by means of adding and incorporating an "eddy current generating means" into the inductor during manufacture. We have experimented with several types of "eddy current generating means" – principally a floating secondary coil and a floating secondary plate.

In the Detailed Action section of your Office Action Summary, you indicated that applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. To this effect, Applicant elects Embodiment One relating to figures 2~8 and 20. The claims that are readable thereon are as follows:

Claims: 1,2,3,4,6,7, 13, 14,15,16,17,18,19,20

The Applicant believes that Embodiment Three relating to figures 12~14 logically follows as an obvious variation of the structures of Embodiment One and that, therefore, the two could well be considered but a single species. This is because Figs 12~14 merely depict the same inductive coil structure as Figs 6~8 but with an extended encapsulating frame. Should this be determined to be the case, then Applicant believes that the listing of claims readable on Embodiment 1 is also appropriately directed to Embodiment 3 together with Embodiment One. The claims that are readable thereon are as follows:

Claims: 1,2,3,4,6,7, 13, 14,15,16,17,18,19,20

Nucore Inc., 5285 NE Elam Young Parkway, Suite A500, Hillsboro, OR 97124, USA.
Office Tel (503) 640-1500, Office Fax (503) 640 6670, Web: www.nucoreinc.com



NUCORE

Page 2/2

4th May, 2005

Ref: Application No. 10/750,214

Attn. Examiner Ms. Jennifer A. Poker



Following the same logic, the Applicant believes that Embodiment Four relating to figures 15~17 logically follows as an obvious variation of the structures of embodiment One and Three and that, therefore, the two could well be considered but a single species. This is because Figs 15~17 merely depict the same inductive coil structure as Figs 6~8 and Figs 12~14 but without use of a solid core and frame. Should this be determined to be the case, then Applicant believes that the listing of claims readable on Embodiment 1 is also appropriately directed to Embodiment 3 together with Embodiment One. The claims that are readable thereon are as follows:

Claims: 1,2,3,4,6,7, 13, 14,15,16,17,18,19,20

Should the examiner determine that it is inappropriate to include embodiment Three and/or Four as components of Embodiment One, then please consider our election to be Embodiment One.

Applicant can understand and accept your suggestion of Embodiment Two relating to Figs 9~11 being a patentable distinct species of the claimed invention:

Applicant can understand and accept your suggestion of Embodiment Five relating to Figs 18 ~19 being a patentable distinct species of the claimed invention.

In conclusion, Applicant requests, if necessary, the assistance of the examiner in reviewing and redrafting the framing of the claims so as to best and most appropriately reflect the understandings presented in this response. We are without patent counsel and are unversed in the proper methodology of the writing and presentation of claims.

Once again, we are most appreciative of your assistance.

Kind Regards

David C. De Thier
President,
Nucore Inc.

Andy Bartha
Andy Bartha,
Inventor, for and on behalf of
Applicants FLANDERS ET AL